Case 1:13-cv-08008-KPF Document 1 Filed 02/27/13 Page 1 of 25

	Odde 1.10 ov oddoo Kri Boodinent 1 Thed of 171710 Trage 1 or 20					
	COPY	1				
1 2 3 4 5.	Linda M. Fong (SBN 124232) KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP 350 Sansome Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: 415-772-4700 Facsimile: 415-772-4707 lking@kaplanfox.com lfong@kaplanfox.com	FILEN				
7	Attorneys for Plaintiffs David Wolf and Miguel Almaraz					
8						
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
10	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	١,				
11	0447 0411	((-				
12	DAVID WOLF and MIGUEL ALMARAZ individually and on behalf of	COX				
13	ALMARAZ, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT					
14	Plaintiffs, JURY TRIAL DEMANDED					
15	ν,					
16						
17	RED BULL GMBH, a foreign company; RED BULL NORTH AMERICA, INC., a					
18	California corporation; and RED BULL DISTRIBUTION COMPANY, INC., a					
19	Delaware corporation,					
20	Defendants.					
21						
22						
23	DAVID WOLF and MIGUEL ALMARAZ ("Plaintiffs"), by and through their attorneys,					
24	on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, bring this Class Action Complaint					
25	against Defendants RED BULL GMBH, a foreign company; RED BULL NORTH AMERICA,					
26	INC., a California corporation, and RED BULL DISTRIBUTION COMPANY, INC., a Delaware					
27	corporation (collectively "Defendants") and allege, based upon personal knowledge as to					
28	themselves and their own acts, and as to all other matters upon information and belief, as follows:					

I. NATURE OF ACTION

- 1. Plaintiffs bring this nationwide class action on behalf of a proposed class and subclass more fully defined below, of all similarly situated consumers who purchased Red Bull energy drinks designed, manufactured, marketed, advertised, distributed and/or sold by Defendants, or their predecessors, successors, or subsidiaries.
- 2. Defendants manufacture, market, distribute and/or sell their product throughout the United States including California under various brand and product names including, but not limited to, Red Bull® Energy Drink, Red Bull® Sugarfree, Red Bull® Total Zero and Red Bull® Editions (collectively "Red Bull" or the "product").
- 3. According to Defendants, Red Bull is the No. 1 selling energy drink, both in the United States and globally, and is available in over 159 countries. In 2011 alone, approximately 4.6 billion cans were sold worldwide, and in the United States 1.65 billion cans were sold.
- 4. During the class period, Defendants have made various representations to consumers about the purported superior nature of Red Bull, over simpler and less expensive caffeine only products, such as caffeine tablets or a cup of coffee. To bolster those claims Defendants post "scientific studies" on the Red Bull website which they say "prove" Red Bull's superiority.
- 5. However, no competent, credible and reliable scientific evidence exists to support Defendants' claims about the product. The New York Times recently reported that "interviews with researchers and a review of scientific studies show: the energy drink industry is based on a brew of ingredients that, apart from caffeine, have little, if any benefit for consumers." The article continues: "Promoting a message beyond caffeine has enabled the beverage makers to charge premium prices. A 16-ounce energy drink that sells for \$2.99 a can contains about the same amount of caffeine as a tablet of No Doz that costs 30 cents."
- 6. Defendants' extensive and comprehensive nationwide marketing campaign *via* television commercials, internet websites and postings, promotional events, radio media,

Barry Meier, Energy Drinks Promised Edge, but Experts Say Proof is Scant, N.Y. Times, Jan. 1, 2013, at 1.

advertising and packaging, was devised to mislead Plaintiffs and members of the putative class.

By disseminating false and misleading information about Red Bull, Plaintiffs and members of the

1.5

putative class were induced into purchasing, at a premium price, millions of dollars worth of Red Bull.

7. Defendants knew or should have known that there is no greater benefit of ingesting Red Bull than ingesting an equivalent dose of caffeine and have taken no meaningful steps to clarify consumer misconceptions regarding the product.

8. As a result of Defendants' pervasive pattern of deceptive, false and otherwise improper advertising, sales and marketing practices and through other actions and inactions complained of herein, Defendants violated the Consumer Legal Remedies Act, Civil Code §§1750, et seq., and the Unfair Competition Law, Business & Professions Code, §§17200, et seq. and were unjustly enriched. To remedy Defendants' illegal conduct, Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and other similarly situated purchasers seek restitution, monetary damages, equitable relief, declaratory relief and/or disgorgement of profits in connection with Red Bull designed, manufactured, marketed, advertised, distributed and sold by the Defendants, or by their predecessors, successors or subsidiaries.

II. PARTIES

A. Plaintiffs

- 9. Plaintiff David Wolf, a resident and citizen of Los Angeles County, California, has purchased and ingested Red Bull manufactured and marketed by Defendants over approximately the last three years. Had he known of the true character and quality of Red Bull, he would not have purchased (or would have paid less for) the product.
- 10. Plaintiff Miguel Almaraz, a resident and citizen of Los Angeles County,
 California, has purchased and ingested Red Bull manufactured and marketed by Defendants over
 the past several years. Had he known of the true character and quality of Red Bull, he would not
 have purchased (or would have paid less for) the product.

B. Defendant

11. Defendant Red Bull GmbH, is a company organized and existing under the laws of

Austria, and offers various goods and services, most notably energy drinks, throughout many countries of the world, including the United States, and sponsors numerous sports- and entertainment-related events.

- 12. Defendant Red Bull North America, a wholly owned subsidiary of Red Bull GmbH, is a California corporation headquartered in Santa Monica, California. Red Bull GmbH offers its goods and services in the United States through Red Bull North America.
- Delaware corporation, is the largest distributor of Red Bull products in North America. Red Bull Distribution has 32 distribution centers across the country, including Northern and Southern California, and maintains a principal office in Santa Monica, California.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 14. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) and the Class Action Fairness Act, in that plaintiffs and certain of the defendants in this action are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs.
- 15. This court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants Red Bull North America and Red Bull Distribution because they are headquartered in this District, and all Defendants conduct substantial business in California, including the marketing, sale and distribution of Red Bull, and have sufficient contacts with California or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the laws and markets of California, so as to sustain this Court's jurisdiction over Defendants.
- Defendants maintain headquarters in this District and/or a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiffs' claims occurred in this judicial district. In addition,

 Defendants do business and/or transact business in this judicial district, and therefore, are subject to personal jurisdiction in this judicial district and reside here for venue purposes.

IV. SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

17. Introduced into the United States in 1997, Red Bull is the No. 1 selling energy drink in the United States and globally. Defendants have invested millions of dollars promoting

the Red Bull products and services, including energy drinks in the United States. In 2011 alone, Defendants spent approximately \$386.2 million in marketing expenses in the United States. The public is exposed to the Red Bull marks, a distinctive design on its cans and promotions, on clothing and other merchandise (e.g., coolers, tents and umbrellas), on television, in print media, on the Internet (including on various social media websites such as Facebook where Red Bull has more than 29 million fans, and YouTube where Red Bull videos have received more than 102.9 million views), at sporting and cultural events organized and/or sponsored by Red Bull (e.g., on Formula One race cars and at Red Bull New York soccer games at Red Bull Arena in New York) and through numerous other means.

- 18. Defendants sell or distribute Red Bull to consumers throughout California and the United States in four varieties: Red Bull Energy Drink, Red Bull Sugarfree, Red Bull Total Zero and Red Bull Editions. Red Bull Editions are available in multiple flavors including cranberry, blueberry and lime. Red Bull contains caffeine, taurine, glucuronolactone, a blend of vitamins B6, B12, niacin and pantothenic acid, sucrose, glucose and Alpine spring water.
- 19. Defendants have made various representations to consumers about the purported superior nature of Red Bull, over simpler and less expensive caffeine only products, such as caffeine tablets or a cup of coffee. To bolster those claims Defendants cite specific "scientific studies" on the Red Bull website which they say "prove" Red Bull's superiority. For example, Defendants state:

Red Bull Energy Drink is a functional beverage. Thanks to a unique combination of high quality ingredients Red Bull Energy Drink vitalizes body and mind. Numerous scientific studies on the product and the individual ingredients prove that Red Bull Energy Drink:

- Increases performance
- Increases concentration and reaction speed
- Improves vigilance
- Stimulates metabolism
- Makes you feel more energetic and thus improves your overall well-being

Red Bull Energy Drink has been developed for people who want to have a clear and focused mind, perform physically, are dynamic and performance-oriented whilst also balancing this with a fun and active lifestyle. In short, Red Bull gives

wings to people who want to be mentally and physically active and have a zest for life.²

- 20. In addition, Defendants represent to consumers that the "studies" confirm the Product's superiority:
 - "It has been extensively studied that Red Bull increases performance"
 - "In various studies it was proven that Red Bull increases concentration and reaction speed"
 - There exist "relevant studies about Red Bull improving vigilance"
 - "A range of studies have verified that Red Bull stimulates metabolism"
 - That Red Bull "Makes you feel more energetic and thus improves your overall well-being" ... "has been validated"
- 21. Defendants also represent to consumers that: "Numerous scientific studies* in the fields of sports medicine and psychology confirm the effects described for Red Bull Energy Drink. All scientific studies were done by independent third parties, are published in peer-reviewed journals and can be found in public databases."
- 22. Although Defendants rely upon "scientific" studies and research which purport to substantiate the product claims, independent researchers and industry experts have found otherwise. In a January 2013 New York Times article titled, "Energy Drinks Promised Edge, but Experts Say Proof is Scant," the author cites widespread scientific and governmental criticism of manufacturers' assertion that energy drinks provide any more benefit than the average dose of caffeine consumed in a cup of coffee.
- 23. Despite the lack of any reported scientific support for a claim that Red Bull provides more benefit to consumers than a caffeine tablet or cup of coffee, Defendants continue to market the product as a superior source of energy worthy of a premium price.

http://www.redbull.com/cs/Satellite/en_INT/Red-Bull-Energy-Drink/001242937921959

http://www.redbull.com/cs/Satellite/en_INT/Red-Bull-Energy-Drink/001242937921959?pcs_c=PCS_Product&pcs_cid=1242937842064&pcs_pvt=faqs

Barry Meier, Energy Drinks Promised Edge, but Experts say Proof is Scant, N.Y. Times, Jan. 1, 2013.

- 24. Additionally, even though the Red Bull website asserts that the product's B-group vitamins (niacin, pantothenic acid, and vitamins B6 and B12) "play an important role in energy metabolism, such as the build-up and break-down of carbohydrates, fat and protein," and "support mental and physical performance," a study undertaken at Vanderbilt University (directed at 5-Hour Energy, an energy shot product), sheds light on the true effects and dangers of some of these ingredients:
- (a) Niacin (vitamin B3): A niacin flush can cause liver toxicity, worsening of stomach ulcers and altered blood sugar or insulin levels or uric acid concentrations;
- (b) Vitamin B6: It has yet to be shown that B6 supplementation in healthy people causes enhanced cognitive function;
- (c) Vitamin B12: There is no evidence of the efficacy of vitamin B12 on cognitive function.
- 25. The ultimate conclusion, based in part on another scientific study, was that B6, B12 and folic acid supplementation, alone or in combinations, do not provide adequate evidence for a beneficial effect of supplementation on cognitive function testing in people with either normal or impaired cognitive function. This conclusion only serves to highlight the discrepancy between the advertising claims and the actual science and research.
- 26. In a 2003 article titled, "Debunking the Effects of Taurine in Red Bull Energy Drink," the study concluded that the claimed improvement in cognitive capabilities and muscular performance were more plausibly related to caffeine alone rather than the purported unique combination of the key components of caffeine, taurine and glucuronolactone. The report

Megan Rogers, 5-Hour Energy: The Healthy Energy Drink?, Vanderbilt Univ. Psych. Dept., available at http://healthpsych.psy.vanderbilt.edu/2008/5-HourEnergy.htm

Woojae Kim, Debunking the Effects of Taurine in Red Bull Energy Drink, Nutrition Bytes, Department of Biological Chemistry, UCLA, David Geffen School of Medicine, UC Los Angeles, 2003.

23

24

25

26

27

28

concluded that "it seems that drinking a cold cup of coffee may induce the same 'energizing and refreshing' effects of drinking Red Bull-and best of all, at one-third the cost."

- More recently, a study on the cognitive effects of key energy drink ingredients 27. caffeine, taurine and glucose similarly concluded that caffeine content, but not taurine or glucose in energy drinks, drives cognitive improvements in executive control, working memory and psychomotor performance.7
- Another study reached a similar conclusion after its evaluation of multiple 28. ingredients commonly found in energy drinks such as Red Bull, including taurine, glucuronolactone, glucose, B vitamins, guarana, yerbe mate, carnitine, St. John's wort and ginseng. The study concluded that there is little, if any, solid evidence to support an increase in either physical or mental energy due to consumption of energy drinks except for the increases attributable to caffeine.
- Finally, the European Food and Safety Commission undertook a study of taurine 29. and found that no cause and effect relationship has been established between taurine and its contribution to cognitive function, cardiac function and a delay in the onset of physical fatigue.9

The Product and Defendant's Advertising

- Defendants' exhaustive advertising campaign builds on this deception. In truth, 30. Defendants have no independent, reliable or competent support for their claims.
 - In a New York Times article, 10 the reporter notes: 31.

http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/2083.pdf.

Grace Giles and Caroline Mahoney, et al, Differential Cognitive Effects of Energy Drink Ingredients: Caffeine, Taurine, and Glucose, Pharmacology, Biochemistry, and Behavior 102 (2012) 569-577.

Tom M. McLellan and Harris R. Lieberman, Do Energy Drinks Contain Active Components Other Than Caffeine?, 70 Nutrition Rev. 12, 730-744 (Dec. 2012).

European Food & Safety Commission Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA), Scientific Opinion on the Substantiation of Health Claims Related to: ... Vitamins, Minerals, Lysine and/or Argeninine and/or Taurine...Pursuant to Article 13(1) of Regulation EC No 1924/2006, 9 EFSA J. 4: 2083, *1 - *34 (Apr. 8, 2011),

On its website, the producer of Red Bull ...states that "more than 2,500 reports have been published about taurine and its physiological effects," including acting as a "detoxifying agent." In addition, that company, Red Bull of Austria, points to a 2009 safety study by a European regulatory group that gave it a clean bill of health.

But Red Bull's Web site does not mention reports by the same group, the European Food Safety Authority, which concluded that claims about the benefits in energy drinks lacked scientific support. Based on those findings, the European Commission has refused to approve claims that taurine helps maintain mental function and heart heatlh and reduces muscle fatigue.

- 32. Defendants' nationwide advertising campaign for Red Bull has been extensive and comprehensive throughout the Class Period. Defendants have spent millions of dollars conveying to consumers across the United States their persistently deceptive message that Red Bull's "unique combination of high quality ingredients" increases performance, concentration and reaction speed, improves vigilance, stimulates metabolism and makes you feel more energetic, over a caffeine tablet or standard cup of coffee.
- 33. Defendants have orchestrated their deceptive Red Bull advertising campaign by using a variety of media, including television, newspapers, radio, media tours, the Internet, email blasts, video news releases, point of sale displays and prominently on the product's packaging.

 As a result of this pervasive and uniform advertising campaign, Defendants have elevated Red Bull to become one of the top sellers in the energy drink category.
- 34. As a result of Defendants' deceptive and misleading messages and omissions about Red Bull, conveyed directly through their marketing and advertising campaigns, Defendants have been able to charge a significant price premium for Red Bull over traditional caffeine products, which has convinced consumers to pay for a purportedly superior product, as their advertising misleadingly conveys.
- 35. Defendants' false and misleading representation to consumers claiming Red Bull provides increased performance, concentration and reaction speed, and improved vigilance, and

Footnote continued from previous page

See fn. 4 above.

stimulates metabolism and makes you feel more energetic, over a caffeine tablet or standard cup of coffee, and its omissions regarding the product's potential health risks have been—and continue to be—material to consumers, including Plaintiffs and other members of the putative class, and Defendants know that its misleading representations are material in nature.

The False, Misleading and Deceptive Claims

- 36. Defendants' claims about Red Bull's effectiveness and superiority with regard to energy, physical and mental performance, and alertness benefits to consumers over a caffeine tablet or standard cup of coffee are false, deceptive, unfair and unconscionable because there is not sufficient, competent and/or reliable scientific evidence and/or substantiation for Red Bull's effectiveness and superiority claims when the product is used by the consuming public in real world settings.
- 37. There is no competent, credible and reliable scientific evidence that is sufficient in quality and quantity, based on standards generally acceptable in the relevant scientific fields, when considered in light of the entire body of relevant and reliable scientific evidence, to substantiate its claims regarding the superior effectiveness of Red Bull.
- 38. Defendants' purported scientific evidence is neither competent nor reliable.

 Defendants do not possess any tests, analyses, research, or studies that have been conducted and evaluated in an objective manner.

The Health Related Issues

39. In response to the question "Is Red Bull safe to drink?" on the online FAQ web page, Defendants reassure consumers that "Red Bull is a safe product and health authorities around the world have confirmed this. Red Bull Energy Drink is available in more than 160

countries and last year alone, more than four billion cans and bottles were consumed across the world. About 30 billion cans have been consumed since Red Bull was created 24 years ago."11

- 40. However, in the article, "Caffeinated Energy Drinks A Growing Problem," the authors note that the main active ingredient in energy drinks including Red Bull is caffeine, although other substances such as taurine, riboflavin, pyridoxine, nicotinadmide, other B vitamins, and various herbal derivatives are also present. "The acute and long-term effects resulting from excessive and chronic consumption of these additives alone and in combination with caffeine are not fully known." 13
- 41. Defendants' national advertising campaign for Red Bull targets children, adolescents and young adults. The Rudd Center for Food Policy and Obesity, Yale University, says that Red Bull has 20 million followers on Facebook, 223,000 on Twitter and gets 158 million YouTube views monthly. A study titled, "Health Effects of Energy Drinks on Children, Adolescents and Young Adults" and the following conclusions with respect to the supplements:
- (a) Energy drinks have no therapeutic benefit, and both known and unknown pharmacology of various ingredients, combined with reports of toxicity, suggest that these drinks may put some children at risk for serious adverse health effects;
- (b) Typically, energy drinks contain high levels of caffeine, taurine and guarine, which have stimulant properties and cardiac and hematologic activity, but manufacturers claim that energy drinks are nutritional supplements which shields them from the caffeine limits

http://www.redbullusa.com/cs/Satellite/en_US/red-bull-energy-drink/001242989766321?pes_c=PCS_Product&pcs_cid=1242989299257&pcs_pvt=faqs

Chad J. Reissig, et al., Caffeinated Energy Drinks—A Growing Problem, 99 Drug & Alcohol Dependence 1-3, 1-10 (Jan. 2009).

¹³ Id. at 2

http://www.philly.com/philly/health/Energy-Drinks-Are-Targeting-Your-Kids-Behind-Your-Back,html

Sara Seifert and Judith Schaechter, et al, Health Effects of Energy Drinks on Children, Adolescents and Young Adults, 127 Pediatrics 3, 511-528 at 522 (Mar. 2011).

 imposed on sodas and the safety testing and labeling required of pharmaceuticals;

- (c) Other ingredients vary, are understudied, and are not regulated;
- (d) Youth-aimed marketing and risk-taking adolescent development tendencies combine to increase overdose potential;
- (e) High consumption is suggested by self-report surveys but is under-documented in children (deleterious associations with energy drink consumption have been reported globally in case reports and popular media); and
- (f) Interactions between compounds, additive and dose-dependent effects, long-term consequences, and dangers associated with risky behavior in children remain to be determined.
- 42. As a result of Defendants' deceptive and misleading messages and omissions about Red Bull, conveyed directly through their marketing and advertising campaigns, Defendants have been able to charge a significant price premium for Red Bull over traditional caffeine products, which they have convinced consumers to pay for a purportedly superior product, which may in fact pose serious undisclosed health risks.

Defendants' Concealment

- 43. Defendants were and remain under a duty to Plaintiffs and the putative class to disclose the facts, as alleged herein. The duty to disclose the true facts arises because, as manufacturer, distributor and marketer, Defendants are in a superior position to know the true character and quality of their products and the true facts are not something that Plaintiffs and putative class members could, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, have discovered independently prior to purchasing Red Bull.
- 44. The facts concealed and/or not disclosed to Plaintiffs and the class, specifically that consumers do not receive additional energy, physical/mental performance and alertness benefits over a caffeine tablet or standard cup of coffee, and the product's potential health risks, are material facts in that a reasonable person would have considered them important in deciding whether or not to purchase (or pay the same price for) Red Bull.

- 45. Defendants intentionally concealed and/or failed to disclose the shortcomings of Red Bull for the purpose of inducing Plaintiffs and putative class members to act thereon.
- 46. Plaintiffs and the putative class members justifiably acted upon, or relied upon to their detriment, the concealed and/or non-disclosed material facts as evidenced by their purchase of Red Bull. Had they known of the true character and quality of Red Bull, Plaintiffs and the putative class members would not have purchased (or would have paid less for) the product.
- 47. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' misconduct, Plaintiffs and the putative class members have suffered actual damages. Defendants' conduct has been and is malicious, wanton and/or reckless and/or shows a reckless indifference to the interests and rights of others.

V. CLASS ALLEGATIONS

48. Pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs bring this class action on behalf of themselves and all members of the following class (the "Class"):

All persons throughout the United States who purchased Red Bull, except for resale, within the applicable statutory limitations period, including the period following the filing date of this action.

Additionally, Plaintiffs bring this action pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of themselves and a subclass of similarly situated individuals, defined as:

All persons residing in California who purchased Red Bull, except for resale, within the applicable statutory limitations period, including the period following the filing date of this action (the "California Subclass").

Excluded from the Class and the California Subclass are: (1) any Judge or Magistrate presiding over this action and members of their families; (2) Defendants, Defendants' subsidiaries, parents, successors, predecessors and any entity in which the Defendants or their parents have a controlling interest and their current or former employees, officers and directors; (3) counsel for Plaintiff and Defendants; and (4) legal representatives, successors or assigns of any such

excluded persons.

- 49. Plaintiffs believe that the Class and California Subclass include thousands of consumers across the United States, though the exact number and the identities of the Class members are currently unknown.
- 50. The members of the Class and California Subclass are so numerous that joinder of all Class members is impracticable.
- 51. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Class and California Subclass and predominate over any questions affecting solely individual members of the Class and California Subclass. Nearly all factual, legal and statutory relief issues raised in this Complaint are common to each of the members of the Class and California Subclass and will apply uniformly to every member of the Class and California Subclass. Among the questions of law and fact common to Class and California Subclass members are:
 - (a) Whether Defendants engaged in the wrongful conduct alleged herein;
- (b) Whether, in its normal and customary use by consumers, Red Bull works as advertised, marketed and conveyed to consumers;
- (c) Whether, in the course of business, Defendants represented that Red Bull has characteristics, uses, benefits or qualities that it does not have when used in a customary manner by consumers;
- (d) Whether the claims Defendants made and are making regarding Red Bull are unfair or deceptive, specifically, whether Red Bull provides additional energy, mental and physical performance and alertness benefits to consumers over a caffeine tablet or a standard cup of coffee;
- (e) Whether Defendants have been unjustly enriched through their acts and/or omissions alleged herein;
- (f) Whether the Plaintiffs and Class members that purchased Red Bull suffered monetary damages and, if so, what is the measure of those damages;
 - (g) Whether Plaintiffs and Class Members are entitled to an injunction, damages,

restitution, equitable relief and other relief deemed appropriate and the amount and nature of such relief.

- 52. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of other members of the Class and California Subclass because Plaintiffs and every member of the Class and California Subclass have suffered similar injuries as a result of the same practices alleged herein. Plaintiffs have no interests adverse to the interests of the other members of the Class and California Subclass.
- 53. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class and California Subclass. Plaintiffs have retained able counsel with extensive experience in class action litigation. The interests of Plaintiffs are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the interests of the other Class and California Subclass members.
- 54. The questions of law and fact common to the members of the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, including legal and factual issues relating to liability and damages.
- Defendants' unlawful and wrongful conduct. Absent a class action, Defendants will retain substantial funds received as a result of their wrongdoing, and such unlawful and improper conduct shall, in large measure, go unremedied. Absent a class action, the members of the Class will not be able to effectively litigate these claims and will suffer further losses, as Defendants will be allowed to continue such conduct with impunity and retain the proceeds of its ill-gotten gains.
- 56. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because joinder of all Class members is impracticable. Moreover, because the damages suffered by individual members of the Class are relatively small, the expense and burden of individual litigation make it impossible for members of the Class to individually redress the wrongs done to them. The Class is readily definable, and prosecution of

this action as a class action will eliminate the possibility of repetitious litigation. There will be no difficulty in the management of this action as a class action.

COUNT I

CONSUMER LEGAL REMEDIES ACT

(Violations of Cal. Civil Code § 1750 et seq.)

- 57. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though fully set forth herein.
- The Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Civil Code Section 1750 et seq. (hereinafter "CLRA") was designed and enacted to protect consumers from unfair and deceptive business practices. To this end, the CLRA sets forth a list of unfair and deceptive acts and practices in Civil Code Section 1770.
- 59. The CLRA applies to Defendants' actions and conduct described herein because it extends to the sale of goods or services for personal, family or household use.
- 60. At all relevant times, Plaintiffs and members of the Class were "consumers" as that term is defined in Civil Code Section 1761(d).
- 61. The transactions from which this action arises include transactions involving the sale or lease of goods or services for personal, family or household purposes within the meaning of Civil Code Section 1761.
- 62. Defendants' practices in connection with the marketing and sale of Red Bull violate the CLRA in at least the following respects:
- a. In violation of Section 1770(a)(5), Defendants knowingly misrepresented the character, uses and benefits of Red Bull;
- b. In violation of Section 1770(a)(7), Defendants represented that Red Bull is of a particular standard, quality or grade, which it is not; and
- c. In violation of Section 1770(a)(9), Defendants have knowingly advertised Red Bull with the intent not to sell the product as advertised.
- 63. Defendants represent that Red Bull increases performance, concentration and reaction speed, improves vigilance and provides additional energy or similar words intended to

convey to consumers that the consumer was obtaining a product that provides more benefit to consumers than a caffeine tablet or cup of coffee including but limited to the enhancement of physical or cognitive performance. These representations are false and misleading in that there is a lack of any reported scientific support for a claim that Red Bull provides more benefit to consumers than a caffeine tablet or cup of coffee.

- 64. Defendants' acts and practices, undertaken in transactions intended to result and which did result in the purchase of Red Bull by consumers, violate Civil Code Section 1770 and caused harm to Plaintiffs and Class and California Subclass members who would not have purchased (or paid as much for) Red Bull had they known the truth. The acts and practices engaged in by Defendants that violate the CLRA include inducing Plaintiffs and the Class and California Subclass to purchase (or pay more for) Red Bull than they would otherwise have paid had they known the truth.
 - 65. Plaintiffs were injured by purchasing (or overpaying for) Red Bull.
- 66. In accordance with Civil Code § 1780(a), Plaintiffs and members of the Class and California Subclass seek injunctive and equitable relief for violations of the CLRA. In addition, after mailing appropriate notice and demand in accordance with Civil Code § 1782(a) & (d), Plaintiffs will subsequently amend this Class Action Complaint to also include a request for damages. Plaintiffs and members of the Class and California Subclass request that this Court enter such orders or judgments as may be necessary to restore to any person in interest any money which may have been acquired by means of such unfair business practices, and for such other relief, including attorneys' fees and costs, as provided in Civil Code § 1780 and the Prayer for Relief.

COUNT II

UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW

(Violations of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et. seq.)

67. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though fully set forth herein.

- 2 3

- 10 11
- 12
- 14 15
- 16
- 18
- 19 20
- 21
- 22
- 23 24

27

28

- 68. Defendants have engaged in unfair competition within the meaning of California Business & Professions Code Section 17200 et seq. because Defendants' conduct is unlawful, misleading and unfair as herein alleged.
 - Defendants' business practices are unlawful because they violate the CLRA. 69.
- Defendants' business practices are misleading because they were likely to deceive 70. consumers into believing that they are obtaining a product that provides more benefit to consumers than a caffeine tablet or cup of coffee including but not limited to the enhancement of physical or cognitive performance.
- Defendants' business practices, and each of them, are unfair because they offend 71. established public policy and/or are immoral, unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous and/or substantially injurious to consumers, which harm greatly outweighs any benefit associated with the business practice, in that consumers are led to believe that the product they were paying for had qualities that it did not have.
- 72. Plaintiffs have standing to pursue this claim because they have been injured by virtue of suffering a loss of money and/or property as a result of the wrongful conduct alleged herein. Plaintiffs would not have purchased Red Bull (or paid as much for it) had they known the truth.
- Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to relief, including full restitution and/or 73. restitutionary disgorgement, to the greatest extent permitted by law, which may have been obtained by Defendants as a result of such business acts or practices, and enjoining Defendants to cease and desist from engaging in the practices described herein.

COUNT III

UNJUST ENRICHMENT

- 74. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though fully set forth herein.
- Plaintiffs and Class members conferred a monetary benefit on Defendants by 75. purchasing Red Bull. Plaintiffs and Class members would have expected remuneration from Defendants at the time this benefit was conferred had they known that the product did not

perform as promised and Defendants' claim that its product is a superior source of energy and other benefits worthy of a premium price is unsupported by competent, credible and reliable scientific evidence to substantiate such claims.

- 76. As a result of Defendants' deceptive and misleading packaging, advertising, marketing and sale of Red Bull, Defendants were enriched, at the expense of the Plaintiffs and each member of the putative Class, through the payment of the purchase price for Red Bull products.
- 77. Under the circumstances, it would be against equity and good conscience to permit Defendants to retain the ill-gotten benefits that are received from Plaintiffs and members of the Class in light of the fact that the Red Bull products purchased by Plaintiffs and members of the Class were not as Defendants purport them to be, as alleged above.
- 78. It would be unjust and inequitable for Defendants to retain the benefit without restitution or disgorgement of monies paid to Defendants for Red Bull products, or such other appropriate equitable remedy as appropriate, to the Plaintiffs and other members of the Class.

RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and on behalf of the Class and California Subclass, pray for judgment, as follows:

- A. For an Order certifying this case as a class action against Defendants and appointing Plaintiffs as Representatives of the Class;
- B. For an order of compensatory damages, statutory damages, restitution, and all other forms of monetary and non-monetary relief recoverable under California law;
 - C. For costs of suit incurred herein;
 - D. For prejudgment interest to the extent allowed by law;
 - E. For penalties as allowed by law;
 - F. For permanent injunctive relief to enjoin further violations of the law; and
 - G. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury on all issues triable of right by jury. KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP DATED: February 27, 2013 Laurence D. King (SBN 206423) Linda M. Fong (SBN 124232)
KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP
350 Sansome Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 772-4700
Faccinile: (415) 772-4707 Facsimile: (415) 772-4707 lking@kaplanfox.com lfong@kaplanfox.com Justin B. Farar (SBN 211556) KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP 11111 Santa Monica Blvd, Suite 620 Los Angeles, CA 90025 Telephone: (310) 575-8670 Facsimile: (310) 575-8697 jfarar@kaplanfox.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Michael Fitzgerald and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Jay C. Gandhi.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV13- 1444 MWF (JCGx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge

NOTICE TO COUNSEL

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

Western Division 312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012	Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516	L	Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm Riverside, CA 92501

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.



AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Central District of California

David Wolf and Miguel Almaraz, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s)

V,

Red Bull GmbH, a foreign company; Red Bull North America, Inc., a California corporation; and Red Bull Distribution Company, Inc., a Delaware corporation

Defendant(s)

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) Red Bull GmbH Am Brunnen 1 5330 Fuschi am See Austria Red Bull North America, Inc. Red Bull Distribution Company, Inc. c/o CT Corporation System 818 West Seventh Street Los Angeles, CA 90017

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Laurence D. King and Linda M. Fong Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer, LLP 350 Sansome Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94104

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date:

02/27/2013

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12)	Summons	in a	Civil	Action	(Page	2)
---------------------	---------	------	-------	--------	-------	----

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (1))

was r	eceived by me on (date)	- Annales commissions and annales of the state of the sta					
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual at (place)					
		on (date)					
	☐ I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with (name)						
	, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,						
	on (date) , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or						
	☐ I served the summo	ons on (name of individual)	, who is				
	designated by law to	accept service of process on behalf of (name of organization)					
		on (date)	; or				
	☐ I returned the summ	nons unexecuted because	; or				
	☐ Other (specify):		and the second section of the second section of the second section of the second section secti				
	Other (specify).						
	W.						
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$ for services, for a total	al of \$ 0.00				
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this information is true.					
ate:		Server's signature	species from the description of the part of the second description of				
		Printed name and title					
	*						
		Server's address					

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Case 1:13-cv-08008-KPF Document 1 Filed 02/27/13 Page 24 of 25



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

				-				-	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS (Ch	neck box if you are rep	resenting yourself) DE	FENDANTS	(Check	box if you are re	epresenting your	self 🗌)	ì
David Wolf and Miguel Aln situated	naraz, individually and or	behalf of others similarly		Red Bull GmbH, Red Bull North America, Inc. and Red Bull Distribution Company, Inc.					
(b) Attorneys (Firm Nam are representing yoursel' Laurence D. King and Linda 350 Sansome Street, Suite San Francisco, CA 94104	f, provide same.) a M. Fong, of Kaplan Fox		(b) are	Attorneys (Firm representing y	n Name, A ourself, pr	ddress and Telep rovide same.)	bhone Number, I	fyou	
(415) 772-4700					IN GIRA	DIDTIFC C	Simulation Conser On	ab.	
II. BASIS OF JURISDIC	CTION (Place an X in o	ne box only.)	(Place	e an X in one bo	x for plain TF DEF	itiff and one for o		PTF	DEF
1, U.S. Government		uestion (U.S. t Not a Party)	Citizen of A			of Business in t	r Principal Place his State nd Principal Place	_	× 4
2. U.S. Government Defendant		Indicate Citizenship	Citizen or St Foreign Cou	س. _ubjectofa] 3 🔯 :	of Business in A	Inother State		⊠ 5 □ 6.
Deletioant	of Parties in	item (ii)	, overall, coo			,			
	Removed from State Court	3, Remanded from Appellate Court MAND: X Yes	4. Reinsta Reopen	ted or Di	ansferred from strict (Specifi only if dem	y) []	Multi- Olstrict itigation		
	AND THE RESERVE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT								
CLASS ACTION under						COMPLAINT:			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	(Cite the U.S. Civil Status	e under which you are fill	ing and write	e a brief statemer	nt of cause.	Do not cite jurisdi	ctional statutes unl	ess divers	(ty.)
28 U.S.C. Sec. 1332(d)(2) and			protection st	atutes and unjust	enrichmen	nt			
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one bo	ox only).							
OTHER STATUTES	CONTRACT	REAL PROPERTY CON		Naturalization		IER PETITIONS eas Corpus:	PROPERTY 820 Copyright		.,
375 False Claims Act	110 Insurance	240 Torts to Land		ication		ien Detainee			
☐ 400 State Reapportionment	120 Marine	245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real		Other igration Actions	Senter	The state of the s	830 Patent 840 Trademar	k	
410 Antitrust	130 Miller Act	Property		TORTS	530 Ge		SOCIAL SE		
430 Banks and Banking	Instrument	TORTS		AL PROPERTY	.535 De	eath Penalty	861 HIA (1395		
A50 Commerce/ICC	150 Recovery of Overpayment &	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane	- N 3/01	Other Fraud		andamus/Other	862 Black Lun		
460 Deportation	Enforcement of	- 315 Airplane	3711	Fruth in Lending	550 Ci	vil Rights	863 DIWC/DIV		31).
470 Racketeer Influ-	Judgment	Product Liability		Other Personal erty Damage	555 Pr	ison Condition	864 SSID Title	XVI.	
☐ enced & Corrupt Org.	☐ 151 Medicare Act	320 Assault, Libel & Slander				vil Detainee tions of	865 RSI (405 (g	1))	
480 Consumer Credit	152 Recovery of Defaulted Student	330 Fed. Employers'		uct Liability		nement	FEDERALT	AX SUITS	
490 Cable/Sat TV	Loan (Excl. Vet.)	Liability 340 Marine	- Comment	KRUPTCY		TURE/PENALTY	Defendant)	. Plaintiff	or.
850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange	153 Recovery of Overpayment of Vet. Benefits	345 Marine Product	USC 423 \	Nithdrawal 28	G25 Dr Seizure USC 88	rug Related e of Property 21 31	871 IRS-Third	Party 26 U	JSC
Actions 890 Other Statutory	160 Stockholders'	350 Motor Vehicle	USC	157 IL RIGHTS	☐ 690 O	ther			
891 Agricultural Acts	Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability		Other Civil Rights					
B93 Environmental	190 Other	360 Other Personal	441\	/oting		LABOR ir Labor Standards			
☐ Matters ☐ 895 Freedom of Info. ☐ Act	Contract 195 Contract Product Liability	Injury 362 Personal Injury Med Malpratice		Employment	☐ Act ☐ 720 La	bor/Mgmt.			
896 Arbitration	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	365 Personal Injury	☐ 443 H	lousing/ modations	Relatio				
	196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY	Product Liability 367 Health Care/	7.000	merican with	_	ilway Labor Act			
899 Admin. Procedures Act/Review of Appeal of	210 Land	Pharmaceutical	Disat	oilities- loyment	Leave	mily and Medical Act			
Agency Decision	Candemnation 220 Foreclosure	Personal Injury Product Liability	- 446 F	American with		her Labor			
950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	230 Rent Lease &	368 Asbestos Personal Injury	☐ Disak	oilities-Other Education	Litigati 791 En Securit	nployee Ret. Inc.			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: C	Ejectment ase Number	Product Liability	Do Ju	In .		grand the second	de la companya de la		
	U) W	I) VI	म् म	-4					
AFTER	COMPLETING PAGE	1 OF FORM CV-71,	COMPLET	E THE INFORM	NATION R	EQUESTED ON	PAGE 2.		

Page 1 of 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL	CASES: Has this	action been previously filed in this	court and dismissed, remanded or closed?	⊠ NO		YES	
If yes, list case nu	mber(s):	,					
VIII(b). RELATED CA	SES: Have any	cases been previously filed in this co	ourt that are related to the present case?	⊠ NO		YES	
If yes, list case nu	mber(s):						
Civil cases are deeme	d related if a previ	lously filed case and the present case;					
(Check all boxes that a	oply) A. Arise	from the same or closely related transa	ctions, happenings, or events; or				
	B, Call f	for determination of the same or substar	ntially related or similar questions of law and fact;	or:			
	C. For o	ther reasons would entail substantial di	uplication of labor if heard by different judges; or	is :			
	D. Invo	ive the same patent, trademark or copyr	ight <u>, and one of the factors identified</u> above ima, b	or c also is	present.		
	1	ng Information, use an additional sheet					
(a) List the County in the plaintiff resides.	is District; Califor	nia County outside of this District; S	tate if other than California; or Foreign Cour	itry, in whic	h EACH na	med	
Check here if the go	overnment, its ag	encies or employees is a named pla	intiff. If this box is checked, go to item (b).				
County in this District:			California County outside of this District; State, if Country	other than 0	California; or	Foreign	
Los Angeles County							
defendant resides.			itate if other than California; or Foreign Coun		h EACH na	med	
Check here if the go	vernment, its ag	encles or employees is a named det	endant, If this box is checked, go to item (c). [California County outside of this District; State, If		alifornia: or l	oreign	
County in this Districtr*			Country		A11/21/2014 4 V -	*******	
Los Angeles County			Delaware: Austria				
c) List the County in the	s District; Californ	nia County outside of this District; S e the location of the tract of land i					
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if Country	other than C	alifornia, or f	örelgn	
Los Angeles County							
Los Angeles, Orange, San Note: In land condemnatio	Bernardino, Rive n cases, use the loc	rside, Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San ation of the tract of land involved	A / 1		/27, 2013		
ut is used by the Clerk of th	The CV-71 (JS-44) (law. This form, app ne Court for the pu	Civil Cover Sheet and the Information co proved by the Judicial Conference of the pose of statistics, venue and initiating t	DATE: ontained herein neither replace nor supplement IF e United States in September 1974, is required pur the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instruction	e filing and	service of ple al Rule 3-1 is	adings or not filed ons sheet).	
ey to Statistical codes relat Nature of Suit Code	ing to Social Securi Abbreviation	Substantive Statement o	f Cause of Action			Al	
861.	HiA	All claims for health insurance benefit include claims by hospitals, skilled nu (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))	ts (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Se irsing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of	services und	s amended. der the progr	am.	
923)			der Title 4, Part B; of the Federal Coal Mine Health				
all claims filed for child's insurance b			disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Senefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))				
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowe amended. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))	rs insurance benefits based on disability under Titl	e 2 of the So	cial Security	Act, as	
amended.			rity income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended.				
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))	survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Secu	my Act, as a	nenaea.		

Page 2 of 2